

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 100111255-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/050,917

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application of which claims 1, 3, 6, and 15 are independent. Claims 21 and 22 are new and claim 14 is canceled.

No new matter has been introduced by way of the claim additions; entry thereof is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Perholtz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,732,212) (referred to as Perholtz).

Claims 6-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Miseli (U.S. Patent Number 5,537,145).

The above rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

Examiner Interview Conducted

A personal interview was conducted with Examiner Desir on September 7, 2005. The 102 rejection of claims 1-5 and 15-20 over Perholtz was discussed. Perholtz was discussed in detail. It was noted that Perholtz discloses a system with a remote site connected to a host PC having a video display. Perholtz discloses that information displayed on a video display for a PC usually indicates why a failure occurred in the PC. See column 2, lines 9-14. However, it is difficult to take corrective action from a remote site if the information on the PC display cannot be viewed from the remote site. Thus, Perholtz discloses the host PC captures information displayed on the video display, such as video raster output, for transmission to the remote site.

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 100111255-1

App. Ser. No.: 10/050,917

The "video display test" of claim 1 was discussed. Examiner Desir indicated that Perholtz was generally related to diagnosing PC failure and that column 38 discusses color attributes of a video display, so Perholtz teaches a video display test. The Applicants pointed out that column 38 is directed to capturing information displayed on the video for transmission to the remote site and does not disclose a video display test. Furthermore, lines 48-50 disclose that color attributes may not be captured to allow for faster transmission of captured video display text data to the remote site. Thus, Perholtz even teaches away from conducting a video display test because color attributes, which Examiner Desir alleged was part of a video display test, may not be captured as disclosed in Perholtz.

Independent claim 3 recites contacting a service center to obtain a test code. Examiner Desir indicated that the password in Perholtz used by the remote site to access the host unit at the PC is the claimed test code. However, Applicants indicated that the remote site does not contact a service center to obtain a password. Also, the host unit does not contact the remote site to obtain the password.

Independent claim 6 recites a self-test display unit. Examiner Desir indicated that the entire system shown in figure 2B of Miseli is the self-test display unit. As discussed in the interview, however, the system of Miseli includes a system separate from the display device that is operable to test many display devices as each display device is connected to the system. This is unlike the display unit according to an embodiment of the Applicants' invention that includes the test program and processor operable to run the test program all in one display unit, such as in one TV. Thus, the display unit, according to an embodiment of the Applicants' invention, can be tested using a test program without connecting to an expensive system.

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 100111255-1

App. Ser. No.: 10/050,917

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The test for determining if a reference anticipates a claim, for purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, is whether the reference discloses all the elements of the claimed combination, or the mechanical equivalents thereof functioning in substantially the same way to produce substantially the same results. As noted by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Lindemann Maschinenfabrick GmbH v. American Hoist and Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984), in evaluating the sufficiency of an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Court stated:

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.

Therefore, if the cited reference does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, then the cited reference fails to anticipate the claimed invention and, thus, the claimed invention is distinguishable over the cited reference.

Claims 1-5 and 15-20

Claims 1-5 and 15-20, including independent claims 1, 3 and 15, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Perholtz.

Claim 1 recites, "providing an access code to the end user at the remote site to initiate a video display test on the video display device using information stored inside the video display device."

As discussed in the interview, Perholtz fails to teach the video display test. Perholtz discloses capturing the video display raster data, such as text which may indicate the cause of a failure of a PC, for transmission to a remote site. However, capturing video display data is

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 100111255-1

App. Ser. No.: 10/050,917

not the same as testing a display. Examiner Desir indicated that Perholtz was generally related to diagnosing PC failure and that column 38 discusses color attributes of a video display, so Perholtz teaches a video display test. The Applicants pointed out that column 38 is directed to capturing information displayed on the video for transmission to the remote site and does not disclose a video display test. Furthermore, lines 48-50 disclose that color attributes may not be captured to allow for faster transmission of captured video display text data to the remote site. Thus, Perholtz even teaches away from conducting a video display test because color attributes, which Examiner Desir alleged was part of a video display test, may not be captured as disclosed in Perholtz.

Perholtz also fails to teach providing an access code to the end user at the remote site. Perholtz fails to teach providing anything to an end user, let alone providing an access code to an end user. During the interview, Examiner Desir indicated that the host unit connected to the PC in Perholtz is the end user. Applicants indicated that the host unit or the PC is an end user device and not an end user.

According to an embodiment of the Applicants' invention, an end user of a display unit, such as a TV or PC monitor, for example, calls a technical service center with a complaint, such as "blank display". The technical service center operator then tells the end user a secret code and instructs the end user to enter the secret code on the display unit, for example, via the display unit key pad. For example, the secret code is to hold two buttons on the front panel (e.g., both "up" and "down" buttons for brightness) while powering back up. This places the display unit in test mode and runs the test program stored in the display unit. The operator then requests that the end user step through a series of video test patterns by pressing certain buttons on the front panel. Each video test pattern may be preceded by a

PATENT**Attorney Docket No.: 100111255-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/050,917**

display of a brief description about how to properly examine the following test pattern. Alternatively, the brief description may be included in each video test pattern. The operator receives the end user's description of images that he/she sees on the video display screen. Based on this description and feedback from the end user, the operator determines the source of the problem. If the operator decides that the problem is in the display unit itself, the operator will ask the end user to return the monitor for repair or replacement. On the other hand, if the operator decides that the problem is not the display unit but due to other parts of the system, e.g., the video graphic card, he will ask the end user to initiate a diagnostic procedure designed to locate the source of the problem. Alternatively, the diagnostic procedure may be initiated automatically after the video pattern test. Thus, the display unit may be tested without having the end user return the display unit and without having to connect the test unit to expensive testing equipment. See Applicants' specification, page 6, line 27-page 7, line 12.

Examiner Desir alleged that providing an access code to the end user at the remote site was met by a password in Perholtz provided from the remote site to the host unit at the PC. Perholtz fails to teach the password is provided to an end user. Also, the password is provided to the host unit and not provided to the remote site.

Independent claim 3 recites, "contacting a service center to obtain a test code and entering the test code from a keypad on a video display device to initiate a visual test that displays a plurality of video display test patterns on a video display screen using information stored inside the video display device." As discussed in the interview, Perholtz fails to teach contacting a service center to obtain a test code. Examiner Desir indicated that the password in Perholtz used by the remote site to access the host unit at the PC is the

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 100111255-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/050,917

claimed test code. However, Applicants indicated that the remote site does not contact a service center to obtain a password. Also, the host unit does not contact the remote site to obtain the password. Instead, the remote site sends the host unit the password if the remote unit needs to access the host unit to get the captured video raster data. The host unit does not contact the remote site to obtain the password.

Also, Perholtz fails to teach a visual test that displays a plurality of video display test patterns on a video display screen using information stored inside the video display device. Perholtz fails to teach a visual test that displays test patterns. Perholtz fails to teach displaying test patterns using information stored inside the display device.

Claim 3 also recites entering the test code from a keypad on a video display device to initiate a visual; examining each video display test pattern to generate an evaluation; reporting the evaluation to the service center; and receiving a diagnosis from the service center. None of these features are taught by Perholtz.

Independent claim 15 recites, "means for storing information for a video display test program; ... means for executing the video display test program in response to determining that the access code is valid." Perholtz fails to teach a video display test program and means for executing the video display test program in response to determining that the access code is valid.

For at least these reasons, claims 1-5 and 15-20 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 6-14

Claims 6-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Miscli.

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 100111255-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/050,917

The Office Action improperly asserts that Miseli discloses all the elements of claim 6. Claim 6 recites "a self-testing video display device, comprising..." Emphasis added. The display device 135 of Miseli is clearly shown in Figure 3. As shown, the display device 135 includes a column display driver 137, a row display driver 138, a unidirectional data display bus 136, and a display screen 140. See figure 3 and column 5 lines 36-54. The display device 135 does not, however, include a keypad, a memory for storing a video display test program, a processor, or a controller; all of which are recited in claim 6. Accordingly, claims 6-14 are believed to be allowable.

Furthermore, claim 6 recites a self-testing video display device. The video display device 135 of Miseli is not self-testing. Column 5, lines 8-13 of Miseli state that testing and evaluation of display devices require display devices to be connected to a separate computer system 100. The video display device 135 must be connected to the complex system 100 shown in figures 1 and 2B to be tested. The display device 135 is separate from the testing system 100 in Miseli, because Miseli discloses that the multiple display devices may be tested. For example, in order to test a display device the display device must be connected to the system 100. After testing, the next display device is connected and tested, and so on.

According to an embodiment of the Applicants invention, a self-testing display device, such as a TV or PC monitor, is provided that includes a self testing program therein so expensive and complicated equipment is not needed to test the display device.

Claim 6 has also been amended to recite,

wherein the information for the video display test program comprises at least one test pattern and a description on how to properly examine the at least one test pattern, and the description is displayed on the video display screen to instruct a user on how to properly examine the at least one test pattern when the at least one pattern is displayed on the video display test screen.

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 100111255-1

App. Scr. No.: 10/050,917

According to an embodiment, an end user examines the test pattern and describes the test pattern to a service operator. See page 7, lines 1-12. Miseli fails to teach or suggest a description on how to properly examine the test pattern because in Miseli, more than likely an experienced technician is testing and evaluating a display device. Miseli does not disclose a test program for use by an end user. Thus, there is no need in Miseli to provide the description.

Thus, Miseli fails to teach all the features of claim 6 and claims 6-13 are allowable.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 21 and 22 are new. Claim 21 recites, "wherein the processor extracts the information for the video display test program in response to a code entered by a user using the keypad." Miseli fails to teach entering a code to run a video display test program.

Claim 22 recites,

wherein the processor in the video display device extracts the information for the video display test program from the memory in the video display device and executes the video display test program such that the video display device need not be connected to a computer system to execute the test program.

Miseli requires that a separate computer system 100 be connected to the display device 135 to test the display device. See column 5, lines 8-13. Thus, Miseli fails to teach the features of claim 22.

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 100111255-1

App. Ser. No.: 10/050,917


Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 12, 2005

By


Ashok K. Mannava
Reg. No.: 45,301

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.
8221 Old Courthouse Road
Suite 104
Vienna, VA 22182
(703) 652-3822
(703) 880-5270 (facsimile)